ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 29, 2003

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2003-9321

Dear Ms. Sims:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 193418.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received two requests from different requestors for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals issued by the city. Although the city defers to the interested third parties who may have a proprietary interest in the requested information to raise arguments for withholding the requested information, it states that this information may be subject to third party confidentiality claims. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, the city notified six interested third parties, RSKCo, Crawford & Company ("Crawford"), Attenta, Inc. ("Attenta"), Gab Robins North America, Inc. ("GAB"), Huey T. Littleton Claims Service of West Texas, Inc. ("Littleton"), and Hammerman & Gainer, Inc. ("Hammerman"), of the city's receipt of the requests and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why any portion of the requested information relating to each company should not be released to the requestors. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Public Information Act (the "Act") in certain circumstances). We have considered Crawford's arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, no party notified by the city pursuant to section 552.305, other than Crawford, has submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of the submitted information relating to that party should not be released to the requestors. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information relating to each of these parties would implicate their proprietary interests. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm). Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information relating to these parties on the basis of any proprietary interest that they may have in the information. Consequently, the city must release the proposals of RSKCo, Hammerman, Attenta, and GAB to the requestors in their entirety.

We now address the arguments presented to us by Crawford regarding its requested information. Crawford claims that portions of the submitted information relating to it are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "trade secret" from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a "trade secret" to be

> any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to a single or ephemeral event in the conduct of the business . . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business . . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If a governmental body takes no position on the application of the "trade secrets" component of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a person's trade secret claim under section 552.110(a) if the person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception and no one

submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.[1] *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained." Gov't Code § 552.110(b). An entity will not meet its burden under section 552.110(b) by a mere conclusory assertion of a possibility of commercial harm. *Cf. National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765, 770 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The governmental body or interested third party raising section 552.110(b) must provide a specific factual or evidentiary showing that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure of the requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 639 at 4 (1996) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure).

After careful consideration of Crawford's arguments and our review of Crawford's information, we find that Crawford has failed to adequately demonstrate that any portion of its information constitutes trade secret information under section 552.110(a) or information the release of which would cause Crawford substantial competitive harm for purposes of section 552.110(b). Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of Crawford's proposal under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

However, we note that a social security number that we have marked within Crawford's proposal may be excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law.[2] A social security number or "related record" may be

---

[1] The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

> (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
> (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business;
> (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
> (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
> (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
> (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

Restatement of Torts, § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

[2] Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information that is protected from disclosure by other statutes.

excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). These amendments make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained and maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See id.* We have no basis for concluding that this social security number is confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), and therefore excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 on the basis of that federal provision. We caution the city, however, that section 552.352 of the Act imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing this social security number, the city should ensure that it was not obtained or is not maintained by the city pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

In addition, we note that portions of Littleton's proposal may be excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy. Section 552.101 also encompasses information that is protected from disclosure under the common-law right to privacy. Information must be withheld pursuant to the common-law right to privacy when (1) it is highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities and (2) there is no legitimate public interest in its disclosure. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Ind. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *See id.* at 683.

Prior decisions of this office have found that financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy, but that there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure). Based on our review of Littleton's proposal, we find that portions of this proposal, which we have marked, are protected from disclosure under the common-law right to privacy, but only if these portions are associated with actual living individuals whose privacy interests would be implicated by their release. In that event, we conclude that the city must withhold these marked portions of Littleton's proposal pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code. Otherwise, the city must release these marked portions to the requestors.

Finally, we note that portions of Crawford's proposal are copyrighted. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *See id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted

materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making such copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the city must release the proposals of RSKCo, Hammerman, Attenta, and GAB to the requestors in their entirety. We have marked a social security number contained within Crawford's proposal that may be confidential under federal law. The city must withhold the portions of Littleton's proposal, which we have marked, but only if these portions are associated with actual living individuals whose privacy interests would be implicated by their release. The city must release the remaining portions of Crawford's and Littleton's proposals to the requestors in compliance with the applicable copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

Ronald J. Bounds
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJB/sdk

Ref: ID# 193418

Enc. Marked documents

cc: Mr. Stephen Kennedy
President/Owner
Harper-Kennedy & Associates, Inc.
P.O. Box 64308
Lubbock, Texas 79464
(w/o enclosures)

RSKCo
Attn: Ray Wicker
Assistant Vice President
405 State Highway 121 Bypass, Building A, Suite 200
Lewisville, Texas 75067
(w/o enclosures)

Crawford & Company
Attn: Bob Minnie
Branch Manager
3806 50th Street, #210
Lubbock, Texas 79413
(w/o enclosures)

Attenta
Attn: Dan Moore
Senior Vice President
12850 Spurling Road, Suite 210
Dallas, Texas 75230
(w/o enclosures)

Attenta, Inc.
Attn: Pat Mulcahy
Vice President Business Development
5949 Sherry Lane, Suite 1300
Dallas, Texas 75225
(w/o enclosures)

GAB Robins North America, Inc.
Attn: Arthur P. Kirkner
Senior Vice President - ICS Sales Operations
1341 West Mockingbird Lane, Suite 900W
Dallas, Texas 75247
(w/o enclosures)

Huey T. Littleton Claims Service of West Texas, Inc.
Attn: Jeff Bode
Executive Vice President
P.O. Box 163627
Austin, Texas 78716-3627
(w/o enclosures)

Hammerman & Gainer, Inc.
Attn: Robyn C. Tydelski
Senior Marketing Representative
800 West Airport Freeway, Suite 314
Irving, Texas 75062
(w/o enclosures)